

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5-8, 12 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In rejecting the claims the examiner urges that in the absence of recited percentages, the claims are beyond the scope of the specification since the only guidance as to the ratio and percentage of components, including surfactant and lanolin, is in the example and on page 3.

The examiner has not raised any grounds for rejecting claims 3, 4, 13 and 14. Accordingly, it is self-evident that the application can be placed in condition for allowance by revising claim 3 so that it is in Independent form and realigning the dependency of the remaining claims so that they are ultimately dependent on claim 3. Accordingly, claim 3 has been amended so that it is now in Independent form. Claim 4 has been amended so that it now depends on claim 3.

Claims 13 and 14 have been cancelled since they become superfluous in view of the above-discussed amendment to claims 3 and 4.

Claims 1 and 2 have been cancelled since these claims are directed toward broader embodiments than the embodiment of claim 3 which the examiner indicated as being the enabled embodiment.

The dependency of the remaining claims has been adjusted so that they ultimately depend from claim 3.


In view of the above discussed amendments to the claims and the examiner's indication of allowable subject matter with respect to the present claims, applicant

Appl. No. 09/926,599

respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all the claims which are currently pending in the application.

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

Date: March 12, 2004



Joseph DeBenedictis
Registration No. 28,502

BACON & THOMAS
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 683-0500

S:\Producer\jdb\BOULT, WADE\RYAN 926599\Amend 02.wpd